Message

From: Si Kinsella Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Sent: 11/21/2021 9:35:27 PM
To: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Subject: LIPA & South Fork Wind Provided False Information
Attachments: Newsday- South Fork Wind Shortfalls.pdf; MEMO (LIPA to OSC) Re SF RFP.pdf; Block Island Wind Farm (BIWF) Capacity (2017-2021).pdf; Email- PSC Admits to Price of SFW (Nov 15, 2021).pdf

Email successfully sent to 1,073 recipients

South Fork Wind cannot reliably provide power in the summer to meet peak demand.

Dear Fellow Residents:

Today, in a Newsday article (attached), Mark Harrington writes: "LIPA in 2017 decided to move ahead with the South Fork Wind Farm project despite internal findings that its ability to produce energy during critical summer-peak times would be limited to around half the days it was needed, according to a confidential review done for LIPA."

Since 2017, LIPA and South Fork Wind have consistently misled us by claiming that its proposed South Fork Wind Farm "addresses the need identified by LIPA in its 2015 technology-neutral competitive bidding process ("South Fork RFP") for new sources of power generation that could cost-effectively and reliably supply the South Fork of Suffolk County, Long Island." This statement is from the executed Joint Proposal (dated September 17, 2020), signed by South Fork Wind, Win With Wind, Montauk United, Concerned Citizens of Montauk, the Group for the East End, Inc., and Cathy Rogers (recently elected to the East Hampton Town Board). Every part of this statement is false.

The South Fork RFP was not "technology-neutral." According to a memo from LIPA's Maria Gomes to James Iwaneczko of the Office of the State Comptroller, dated January 27, 2017 (see attached at p. 13), "in some instances, proposals were advanced if they were the only proposal offering a particular technology […]. The memo continues: "Two other proposals (i.e., Deepwater Wind […] and Fuel Cell Energy […]) were designated as Semi-Finalists because […] they were the only proposals offering a particular technology." A proposal's technology, clearly, was central to LIPA's decision-making and was not "neutral" by any stretch of the definition.

Nor was the procurement process a "competitive bidding process" given that "Deepwater Wind was the only proposal offering offshore wind technology" (see memo attached at p. 13). It had no competing bids for offshore wind. Unsurprisingly, Deepwater Wind's price of 22 cents per kilowatt-hour is not "cost-effective," especially given that LIPA plans to buy the same renewable energy at nearly one-third the price, at 8 cents (see email PSC Admits to Price, attached).

Finally, as Mr. Harrington writes that, the "study examined two scenarios, with the more conservative approach finding shortfalls of up to 50% during the peak time [and a] second probability review found shortfalls around 42% of the time." Such performance makes a mockery of LIPA's claim that the South Fork Wind Farm represents "new sources of power generation that could […] reliably supply the South Fork […]."

Citing internal LIPA reports, Newsday writes that "the largest energy shortfall risk was in August, when 20 of the 30 days were expected to experience a shortfall, with no battery," [and with] 33 megawatts of battery storage, the number of shortfall days in August was reduced to 7." The report, written in 2016, is remarkably accurate. Five years later, and Deepwater Wind's Block Island Wind Farm shows similar shortfalls.

The Block Island Wind Farm (according to US Energy Information Administration data from 2017 to 2021, see graph attached) had an August average operating capacity of only 24% (over four years). August is the hottest month on Block Island when power is needed more than any other time, but a wind farm cannot reliably provide that power. Earlier this year (in July and August), the Block Island Wind Farm was operating at an average capacity of only 7%. Only one offshore wind turbine was operational at the time—the other four turbines required non-routine repairs and maintenance to faulty blades. As an aside, it also took Deepwater Wind (now Ørsted) four years to permanently bury its exposed high-voltage cable that in prior years ran through a popular recreational beach alongside swimmers.

The evidence (above) contradicts what we have been told. Now, it is clear that LIPA chose South Fork Wind for other reasons.

With best regards,
Si Kinsella

Simon V. Kinsella

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)